

EXHIBIT H

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

3 - - -

4 CRFD RESEARCH, INC.,) Civil Action
5)
6 Plaintiff,)
7)
8 v.)
9)
10 DISH NETWORK CORPORATION,)
11 DISH DBD CORPORATION,)
12 DISH NETWORK L.L.C.,)
13 ECHOSTAR CORPORATION and)
14 ECHOSTAR TECHNOLOGIES)
15 L.L.C.,)
16 Defendants.) No. 14-64-GMS

17 - - -

18 CRFD RESEARCH, INC.,) Civil Action
19)
20 Plaintiff,)
21)
22 v.)
23)
24 HULU, LLC,)
25 Defendant.) No. 14-313-GMS

- - -

Wilmington, Delaware
Monday, January 5, 2015
11:00 a.m.
Telephone Conference

21 - - -

22 BEFORE: HONORABLE GREGORY M. SLEET, U.S.D.C.J.

23 (CAPTION CONTINUES ON FOLLOWING PAGE)
24
25

:56:47

:56:47

1 sensitive information to, so the bar sort of attaches to
2 him, it only attaches to him. It doesn't attach to anyone
3 else in his firm.

4 So to me, I just feel like they have the ability
5 to construct who is going to see who the bar is going to
6 affect, and there would still be other lawyers at their firm
7 who would not be affected by it.

8 THE COURT: Counsel, let me interrupt. I, and
9 Mr. Farnan knows this, I am decidedly not a fan of NPEs.
10 Not because they are doing anything inappropriate or
11 illegal. I think they are functioning well within the
12 confines of a free market economy. It's a rather, I think,
13 clever business construct. It's just a pain in my neck from
14 the standpoint of being a United States Judge, trial judge.

15 So it's a case management burden.

16 I am not going to sign onto or place this
17 Court's imprimatur on language that strikes me, as I have
18 suggested, as fundamentally anticompetitive. This, I think,
19 is a very different construct that we are talking about from
20 that which is involved in the area of prosecution of
21 patents.

22 Yes, it may be a pain in the neck to Hulu and
23 Netflix and all the practicing entities out there. But
24 welcome to the party. Okay? And get used to it, at least
25 insofar as this judge concerned.